

Appln No. 09/642,190

Amdt date November 21, 2003

Reply to Office action of September 11, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Mohri et al. (US 5,643,034). Applicants submit that all of the claims previously pending in this application are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, and reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 includes, among other limitations, "wherein the control electrode is formed with a single-layered structure and is positioned directly on an insulating layer on one of the pair of substrates;" and independent claim 13 includes, among other limitations, "wherein the control electrode has a single-layered structure."

Mohri describes a fluorescent display tube including graphite layers. "The graphite layers 4 are covered at their upper surfaces by fluorescent layers 5 and surrounded by ribs 6 formed on the insulating layer 2, as shown in FIG. 3. The ribs 6 are made of an insulating material such as a glass material." (Col. 8, lines 58-61). "On the upper end faces of the ribs 6, there are formed by thick-film printing grid electrodes 7 in the same pattern as the ribs 6. . . . In this arrangement, the grid electrodes 7 are electrically insulated from the fluorescent layers 5". (Col. 8, line 67 to col. 9, line 9). Therefore, the control electrodes of Mohri consist of a two layer structure (i.e., ribs 6 and grid electrodes 7), and not a "single-layered structure," as required by the independent claims 1 and 13. Even, if the grid electrodes 7 of Mohri were construed as control electrodes, they are not "positioned directly on an

Appln No. 09/642,190

Amdt date November 21, 2003

Reply to Office action of September 11, 2003

insulating layer on one of the pair of substrates," as required by the independent claim 1, because they are placed on top of the insulating ribs 6. As a result, the independent claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by Mohri.

In short, the independent claims 1 and 13 define a novel and unobvious invention over the cited references. Dependent claims 2-12 and 14-16 are all dependent from claims 1 and 13, respectively and therefore include all the limitations of their respective independent claims and additional limitations therein. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable over the cited references, as being dependent from allowable independent claim 1 and for the additional limitations they include therein.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By



Raymond R. Tabandeh
Reg. No. 43,945
626/795-9900

RRT/clv

CLV PAS531066.1-* -11/21/03 10:00 AM